DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 205 490 SP 018 660

AUTHOR Bolland, Kathleen A.; And Others
TITLE Teaching Teachers to Teach Teachers. The First Phase of a New Approach to Inservice Education.
SPONS AGENCY Department of Education, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Apr 81
GRANT G007901388
NOTE 53p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Los Angeles, CA, April 14, 1981).
AVAILABLE FROM Project TEDDDIE, University of Kansas, Dept. of Special Education, 377E Haworth Hall, Lawrence, KS 66045 ($4.75).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Cooperative Planning; *Curriculum Development; *Inservice Teacher Education; Needs Assessment; Postsecondary Education; *Program Development; Program Evaluation; Program Validation; *Teacher Participation

ABSTRACT

Teachers can take on the additional responsibility of inservice leadership and can be trained in the processes of curriculum development. Through implementation of those procedures, teachers can initiate an ongoing system of needs-based inservice education. Steps in initiating this process include: (1) Teachers take the major responsibility for identification of needs and strengths and inservice planning; (2) Once needs have been identified, goals and objectives are specified; (3) When goals and objectives have been specified, a validation process allows individuals affected by the inservice process to clarify their needs--an important step in collaborative planning; (4) After teachers validate goals and objectives, they begin to design and develop inservice activities that address specified needs and goals; (5) After activities have been developed, inservice programs are delivered by the designer or by teachers who are proficient at delivery; and (6) Teachers, through evaluating their students' performance and through completing evaluation forms regarding inservice programs they have attended, are capable of sound evaluation of the program they have developed. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED205490

TEACHING TEACHERS TO TEACH TEACHERS

THE FIRST PHASE OF A NEW APPROACH TO INSERVICE EDUCATION

Kathleen A. Bolland

Thomas M. Skrtic

Frances L. Clark

University of Kansas

Draft of a paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Los Angeles, April, 14, 1981

The project reported herein is supported by a grant from the United States Department of Education, Office of Special Education. The opinions expressed are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the position, policy, or endorsement of the Office of Special Education. (Grant #G007901388)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Kathleen Bolland

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SP018660

Abstract

Recent literature suggests that effective inservice education is a teacher-directed, continual process of professional development. To explore the feasibility of this concept, teams of special and vocational educators were trained to design, develop, and deliver inservice education. Evaluative data collected from the teams and their audiences, and project staff observations and experiences, indicate that teachers, with some difficulty, can adopt the additional responsibility of inservice leadership. This suggests a method for providing school systems a lasting resource in teachers able to assess and meet their inservice training needs, thereby creating an ongoing process of professional development.

TEACHING TEACHERS TO TEACH TEACHERS

THE FIRST PHASE OF A NEW APPROACH TO INSERVICE EDUCATION

Need for Improved Inservice Practices

Need for Inservice

The need for continuous professional development is recognized today in many professions. Large insurance companies have staff development directors, management consulting firms offer a wide range of courses for business people, medical doctors read journals and take courses, and teachers have inservice education[1]. In Inservice Education: Priority for the '80s, Johnson (1980) discusses the various factors that make inservice education for teachers particularly important in today's world.

Need for Improved Inservice Practices

The literature on inservice education abounds with criticisms of inservice practice, and inservice, in general, has a poor reputation among teachers. It is clearly worthwhile for those who seek to facilitate the inservice aspect of teacher preparation to do so through improved inservice practices as well as through delivery of appropriate content.

---

[1] The terms inservice education, inservice training, staff development, professional development, professional growth activities, and others are used interchangeably by some authors and with specific meanings by others. We use the terms inservice education and professional development interchangeably for variety. We use the terms broadly, to indicate learning activities undertaken by or presented to incumbent teachers to enhance or foster their professional growth.

Guidelines for Effective Inservice Education

Although there are methodological and reporting problems in many research reviews and in original research (see Cruickshank, Lorish, and Thompson, 1979 for a discussion of some the problems), the lack of well supported empirical evidence regarding inservice education leaves us with this literature as perhaps the best source of direction regarding effective inservice practices. Some confidence can be placed in guidelines extracted from these analyses for two reasons:

1. The guidelines extracted by different reviewers from different sources tend to be similar and not contradictory.
2. The guidelines tend to be consistent with theories of adult learning and educational change.

Still, we must be cautious, for at best the available evidence suggests that certain practices are associated with, rather than cause, effective inservice. The theories add support to the notion that those practices may indeed be causal factors in effective inservice programs, but they do not support a conclusion that the guidelines are necessary for the establishment of effective inservice programs.

Before proceding with a set of guidelines on which to base inservice practices, we must clarify just what an effective inservice program is. Typically, the literature uses one or more of the following criteria to define an effective inservice program:

1. it causes or is associated with desired pupil change
2. it causes or is associated with desired teacher change
3. it is rated positively on a number of factors by the audience (e.g., speaker's knowlege of subject).

Many authors promote pupil change as the ultimate criterion of effective inservice programs, although many accept some kinds

of teacher change--such as making the teacher's job easier--as worthwhile even if the teacher change does not directly lead to pupil change. In other cases, teacher change is used as a criterion because it is assumed to lead to pupil change and is easier to measure. Explicit reasons for using audience opinion as a criterion often are not stated. However, it is reasonable to assume that adults will not learn much from programs they don't like because they are unlikely to attend to information being presented or to become involved in scheduled learning activities (cf. Rosenshine and Berliner, 1978).

With the caution that audience appreciation is only one important factor in determining the effectiveness of an inservice program, we will accept it as a minimum criterion. It is important to obtain evidence that audience appreciation leads to teacher change, and that the teacher change is desirable for its own sake or because it leads to desired pupil change. Lacking that evidence, there should at least be strong supporting theory. Unfortunately, when the evidence is not available, the theory is often assumed rather than explicity stated.

The guidelines for effective inservice presented in Table 1 can serve as theory to direct development of inservice practices. They were extracted from a variety of sources, both reviews of research and reports of original research. The criteria for effective inservice programs were not always specified in the sources, however the guidelines we chose are consistent with theories of adult learning (Knowles, 1978) and appear to be likely to lead to teacher approval of inservice programs and to teacher change.

TABLE 1

GUIDELINES FOR IMPROVED INSERVICE PRACTICES[2]

1. Inservice education programs should be an integral part of the education agency and should receive the explicit support of the administration.

2. Inservice education programs should be collaboratively planned by all those affected (the inservice audience, administration, and providers).

3. Inservice education programs should be based on an assessment of the needs and strengths of the inservice audience.

4. Inservice education programs should have explicit goals and objectives.

5. Inservice education programs should offer a variety of learning activities, including individualized activities, to accommodate individual learning styles of audience members.

6. Inservice providers should be selected for their competence in meeting the needs of the intended audience. Teachers are often competent in meeting their own needs.

7. Inservice education programs should be evaluated by those affected, and evaluation results should be used to assist in planning and implementing ongoing inservice education programs.

---

[2]These guidelines were developed from the following reviews: Skrtic, Knowlton, and Clark, 1979; Skrtic, Clark, and Bolland, 1980; and Hutson, 1979. These reviews included, among other sources, the following: Lawrence, Baker, Elzie, and Hansen, 1974; Edelfelt, 1977; the Rand Change Agent Study (Berman and McLaughlin, 1975 and 1978; McLaughlin and Marsh, 1978); the Inservice Teacher Education Reports (Joyce, Howey, Yarger, Hill, Waterman, Vance, Parker, and Baker, 1976; Joyce, McNair, Diaz, McKibbin, Waterman, and Baker, 1976; Nicholson, Joyce, Parker, and Waterman, 1976; Yarger, Boyer, Howey, Weil, Pais, Warnat, Bhaerman, Duke, Durland, Joyce, and Hill, 1976; Brandt, Mesa, Nelson, Marsh, Rubin, Ashworth, Brizzi, Whiteman, Joyce, Howey, and Boyer with Vance, 1976) a survey by a task force of the National Inservice Network (1980); and texts and articles on adult learning and educational change.

A Curriculum Development Approach to Inservice Education

One way to meet these guidelines is to, with administrative support, involve teachers in an ongoing system of inservice curriculum development and implementation. Once administrative support has been obtained, teachers can be trained in the processes of curriculum development[3], and through implemention of those processes, an ongoing system of needs-based inservice education can be initiated. Skilled teachers and supportive administrators can then maintain the system. The following paragraphs will describe how the guidelines can be met through the processes.

Identification of needs. The first stage of curriculum development is identification of needs. Guidelines 2 and 3 suggest that inservice planning should be a collaborative effort of all affected and that programs should be based on an assessment of the needs and strengths of those who are to be the audience. In most cases, teachers will be the most affected by inservice programs, and they will form the bulk of the audience. It is therefore reasonable for teachers to take major responsibility for identification of needs and strengths and inservice planning. They can be taught to use needs assessment strategies that will also tap the perceptions of administrators, support staff, parents, and even students as appropriate.

Specification of goals and objectives. Once needs have been identified, goals and objectives are specified. This curriculum development stage obviously meets guideline 4 and helps to meet guideline 1.

---

[3]Teachers of course have some of the skills of curriculum development, but in general they tend to be users of rather than developers of curricula. Although several packaged inservice programs and sessions exist, there is no inservice curriculum for teachers to review, modify, and use.

If goals and objectives are written for all the needs identified, they can form the basis for an ongoing collaborative system of professional development. Analysis of needs, strengths, goals, and objectives can reveal a picture of schoolwide needs and suggest appropriate audiences and planners for programs to meet those needs.

Validation. For several reasons, after goals and objectives have been specified, a validation process should occur. When teachers analyze needs assessment results, they will order the needs according to apparent priority and write goals and objectives they believe will meet those needs. The validation process requires the respondents to the initial needs assessment to consider both the priority listing and the specified goals and objectives. They may register disagreement with the priority listing and/or with the goals and objectives. The validation process aids in meeting the first four guidelines by allowing individuals affected by the inservice process to clarify their needs, an important step in collaborative planning.

Design and development of inservice activities. After teachers validate goals and objectives, they can begin to design and develop inservice activities. Teachers, of course, are trained to design and develop learning activities for their students in their own subject areas. For many inservice needs, there will be teachers with the requisite content expertise to fill those needs. Therefore, if teachers are taught principles of adult education, they will be ready to design and develop inservice activities that address the specified goals and objectives. When they do not have the expertise, they can research the subject or collaborate in designing and developing the program with someone who does. They will at least be able to explicitly specify

their needs. Thus, this curriculum development stage aids in meeting guidelines 2 and 5.

Delivery of inservice programs. Inservice programs are delivered after activities have been developed. This stage provides an inservice program for an initial audience and serves as a field test of programs that may be delivered to other audiences. The teachers who designed and developed the activities may be best suited to deliver the program. Some teachers may be more proficient at design and development than delivery and if so, someone else may be selected to deliver a program. When possible and appropriate, this can be another teacher who has been involved in the planning process from the beginning. In some cases a provider may be selected from outside the school system. In any case, when the individuals who have assessed needs and planned programs select inservice providers, they are bound to select competent providers, because they will know precisely what they are seeking. Thus, guideline 6 is met.

Evaluation. The final stage of curriculum development, evaluation, feeds into the initial process of needs identification. Teachers already have some background in evaluation, through evaluating their students' performance and through completing evaluation forms regarding inservice programs they have attended. Instruction in purposes for and methods of evaluation will enable them to design and implement multiple evaluation strategies that will provide them information regarding the effectiveness of their inservice programs. They can then use such information to help them decide: (a) what aspects of their programs are effective and should be continued, (b) what aspects need to be changed, and (c) whether further programs are needed on some topics. This final process of curriculum development meets guideline 6.

Implementation of Guidelines for Effective Inservice

"Training Educators to Design, Develop, and Deliver Inservice Education" is a three-year project based in the University of Kansas Department of Special Education and funded by the Office of Special Education. Its major purpose is to prepare special and vocational educators to meet the career/vocational education needs of handicapped students. The vehicle for this teacher preparation is the facilitation of improved inservice practices. The guidelines for effective inservice were followed in designing the project. The project proposal was written in 1978, however, ongoing needs assessment and evaluation are vital aspects of the project, and thus the guidelines we follow have been updated since the original proposal was written.

After planning meetings and conversations with several special and vocational administrators in Kansas communities, agreement was reached with administrators from three sites. Two sites consisted of special education cooperatives and Area Vocational Technical Schools and the other was a large school district and its Area Vocational Technical School. Administrators agreed to grant released time for inservice team members and to schedule the inservice programs.

Teams of teachers were selected from each site. Each team included at least one vocational instructor, one special education teacher, and one teacher with a role in both areas, such as a work study coordinator for special needs students. Each team comprised three to five teachers.

A graduate level course was conducted in a central location to teach the teams the initial stages of curriculum development. Follow-

ing instruction in needs assessment, goal and objective writing, and validation, the teams implemented each stage in their own schools.

A second graduate course was conducted during the summer on the University of Kansas campus. The teams learned principles of inservice design, development, delivery, and evaluation. While on campus they designed their inservice programs, practiced delivery, and designed evaluation strategies.

In the fall, the teams delivered their inservice programs[4]. All addressed an area of career/vocational education for handicapped students. For example, one focused on tips for teaching special students and another on safety considerations in the vocational classroom. Several were preceded by and were followed up with staff newsletter articles. Some were delivered to joint audiences of special and vocational educators and some to one or the other.

---

[4] The next phase of the project will be an Outreach Phase in which the original teams of teachers will train new teams of teachers from their own and nearby education agencies. This phase has four purposes:

1. It will institute a multiplier effect so that more LEAs will have the benefits of teacher led inservice programs.
2. It will reinforce the inservice curriculum development skills of the original teams (through their teaching of the inservice curriculum development process to others).
3. It will reinforce the institutionalization of ongoing teacher led professional development in the original LEAs as new teams continue the process.
4. It will add to the pool of packaged inservice programs designed and developed for teachers by teachers.

Conclusions

In our experience with the project thus far we have reached several conclusions we hope may help others who wish to improve inservice practices through facilitating teacher involvement. These conclusions were reached from the following sources:

1. Knowledge tests completed by project participants
2. Project staff observations and experiences throughout the project
3. Formative evaluations completed by project participants
4. Formative evaluations completed by inservice audiences
5. Solicited and unsolicited comments from various involved individuals, e.g. administrators, site contact persons, project advisors[5].

The conclusions are presented on the following pages as hypotheses, with each hypothesis accompanied by its justification, conclusions and evidence, and recommendations and remaining questions. This represents a "reconstructed logic" (Kaplan, 1964) because although some of the hypotheses were evident from the beginning of the project, others became clear to us as we gained experience with the project. Besides providing advice to those who may wish to replicate some aspects of our project, we hope these conclusions may provide direction for further inservice research.

---

[5] The appendix includes further details on the evaluation strategies used and data collected.

Hypothesis 1: Some teachers can learn to design, develop, and deliver inservice education programs.

Justification. By virtue of their preparation to be and their experience as teachers, many teachers have many of the basic skills necessary to develop and implement an inservice curriculum. The inservice literature suggests teachers want to be and should be involved in all aspects of their professional development. Therefore, following training in areas of inservice curriculum development and implementation where they lack knowledge and experience, teachers should be able to design, develop, and deliver inservice education.

Conclusions and evidence. Some teachers can learn to design, develop, and deliver inservice education. Some teachers are better at certain aspects than others, however.

1. Comparison of pretests and posttests indicates that teachers did not begin with sufficient knowledge to develop and implement an inservice curriculum. However, all teachers involved gained sufficient knowledge to at least contribute to the design, development, and delivery of an inservice program.

2. Teachers' comments on formative evaluations indicated they were confident they were learning skills that would enable them to design, develop, and deliver inservice programs. Degree of confidence varied with the individual teacher and over time, but in general, more and more teachers became more and more confident as the project progressed.

3. Teachers did design, develop, and deliver inservice education programs. Audience responses were largely positive. Project staff who observed the inservice programs were pleased with the teachers' performances, as were administrators. One administrator commented that the inservice was the best he had seen in the fourteen years he had been at the school.

Recommendations and remaining questions. More teachers should be trained to design, develop, and deliver inservice education. In this way, individual teachers can assume the inservice tasks they do best and let other teachers accomplish other inservice tasks. Further, teachers who know how to design, develop, and deliver inservice programs may be better inservice consumers. This suggests that instruction in aspects of inservice curriculum development should be offered at the preservice level. Investigation into the characteristics that can predict which teachers will best be able to accomplish certain inservice tasks should he initiated.

Hypotheses 2: Teachers who volunteer to become part of an inservice team, who are recognized peer leaders, and who exhibit above average teaching ability will make effective inservice team members.

Justification. In order for teachers to be responsible for their own inservice education, they must commit personal time to inservice curriculum development. If they were to receive a great deal of released time, they would no longer be full-time teachers and some of the advantages of teacher-based inservice would be lost. It is reasonable to expect that teachers who volunteer to be part of the team will be willing to commit their time.

Although the literature on adult learning suggests that effective teaching of adults differs in several respects from traditional teaching of children, it is reasonable to expect that those teachers known for their ability to teach children will be able to teach adults. In addition, those individuals may have greater expertise in the areas for which their colleagues express a need for inservice education. This will facilitate the development of inservice activities.

It is likely that an audience of teachers will respond favorably, initially, to an inservice provider they know as a leader. This will enable the provider to concentrate on matters other than gaining audience attention and acceptance in the first teacher-led inservice program.

Conclusions and evidence. Although it was our intention to choose team members who volunteered and met the other selection criteria, many administrators insisted on selecting participants. In instances where teachers did volunteer, there were not enough to institute a thorough selection process. In addition, in some of our sites, it is not likely that the teachers with the greatest teaching ability would measure up to the "best" teachers in other sites. We do know that we spent more time than we intended "selling" the project concept to the team members, that some of the team members were not well respected by their peers, and that several team members complained about the amount of time they had to devote to the project. On the other hand, each team did successfully design, develop, and deliver inservice programs. Further, one of our contacts in a site told us the teachers who began without the respect of their peers were gaining in acceptance.

Recommendations and remaining questions. We are pressing harder in Phase II (see footnote 4) for team members to volunteer and to meet our selection criteria. Many administrators, however, still want to select participants. So, if administrators insist on selecting team members, extra time should be allowed to build team members' commitment. Care should be taken during training and assignment of inservice tasks so that the inservice curriculum development and implementation process does not suffer from team members who are better suited to particular tasks than others. Research is needed regarding the following question: What characteristics of a classroom teacher predict that teacher's inservice leadership potential and how can administrators be persuaded to choose team members accordingly?

Hypothesis 3: Teachers will design inservice programs that incorporate multiple learning activities.

Justification. A typical complaint of teachers regarding inservice programs is that they are often strictly lecture and therefore boring. They often state the need for more "hands on" experiences. It seems reasonable to expect, then, that in designing inservice programs, teachers would avoid lectures. In addition, our guidelines for effective inservice suggest that a variety of learning activities is appropriate, and therefore that was something we stressed in our training sessions on inservice design and development.

Conclusions and evidence. Although our teams voiced disapproval of long lectures, the inservice programs they designed revolved around lectures. Some included warm-up activities, films, and tours, but these were all discrete activities rather than multiple activities geared toward one purpose.

Recommendations and remaining questions. Apparently single rather than multiple learning activities are easier to design, develop, and deliver. Sometimes, a lecture may be the most appropriate learning activity: if knowledge of a subject is low and time is short, for example. If teachers are to design multiple learning activities, perhaps they need even more encouragement and examples, and the inservice schedule should allow more than just a couple of hours. Alternatively, if single activities are chosen, the reason should be explained to the audience.

Hypothesis 4: Inservice programs planned and delivered by teachers will lead to teacher change, which will lead to pupil change when appropriate.

Justification. Teachers will conduct thorough needs assessments to identify the inservice training their colleagues need. Because of their similar perspectives, they will be able to design programs at the appropriate content level. This makes it likely that teachers will be able to learn what they need. In addition, their colleagues (the inservice leaders) will be available to aid them in making changes based on the inservice program. This teacher change should, in turn, lead to pupil change when pupil change is the goal.

Conclusions and evidence. Many members of the inservice audiences have indicated plans to implement suggestions they obtained from the inservice programs. Of course this is not solid evidence that they will, but it is an important first step. Unfortunately, many of the assessed needs were so great that one or two inservice sessions cannot be expected to completely fulfill them. More sessions will be needed before the expected teacher change can be great enough to lead to measurable pupil change.

Recommendations and remaining questions. Teachers should be involved in designing inservice programs because they are able to specify the appropriate content level. If they do not actually design and develop the program, they should work closely with those who do. When needs are great, immediate teacher and pupil change should not be expected. Rather, the necessary inservice should be planned in sequence, with appropriate evaluation at each step, so that eventually demonstrable pupil change will occur. Methods of documenting teacher and pupil change that are valid and yet minimally time consuming should be explored.

Hypothesis 5: Teachers will appreciate inservice programs planned and delivered by their peers more than those planned and delivered by others.

Justification. In response to questions about the best inservice providers, teachers often state that providers should be individuals with classroom experience, rather than "ivory tower intellectuals." Frequently teachers indicate that either inservice providers did not present anything new, did not present anything useful, or did not present enough information to be practically applicable. Teachers clearly do have classroom experience and should, especially following a needs assessment, have an accurate grasp of the amount and level of information their colleagues need, because those needs will be similar to their own.

Conclusions and evidence. Most teachers did appreciate the inservice programs planned and delivered by their peers as much as or more than those planned and delivered by others. In response to an open-ended question about the best aspects of a program, one teacher indicated that it was nice to know there were teachers in her building to whom she could go for advice. Many teachers who indicated that the teacher-led programs were "about the same" as other inservice programs they had attended said that the other programs were also very good. Most teachers who indicated that teacher-led programs were worse than other programs had several negative comments that were irrelevant to the teacher-led aspects of the programs (for example they were forced to attend because of their contract; they did not want to attend past school hours, but that was the only time their contracts allowed).

Recommendations and remaining questions. Because the majority of teachers exposed to teacher planned and delivered inservice programs appreciate those programs, teachers should be given responsibilities for their own professional development. It is reasonable to expect teachers will benefit more from programs they appreciate. Teacher-led programs are not the only programs teachers appreciate, so further investigation should be conducted regarding the inservice characteristics teachers appreciate. This will aid teachers, administrators, and others involved in collaborative inservice planning when they assign inservice responsibilities and specify requirements for the kinds of inservice programs they need.

Hypothesis 6: After experience with one teacher-led inservice program, administrators, team members, and remaining teachers will request the institutionalization of a system of ongoing inservice education planned and implemented by teachers.

Justification. This hypothesis follows from hypothesis 5. If teachers appreciate teacher-led inservice programs, it is reasonable to expect they will want more. If the inservice leaders are appreciated by their peers, they should want to continue to receive that appreciation (and they should be able to enlist some help, following a successful experience). If administrators perceive that teachers appreciate teacher-led inservice programs, they should be willing to share the responsibility of inservice planning and implementation.

Conclusions and evidence. Teachers' appreciation of teacher-led inservice programs is not sufficient to ensure institutionalization of the practice. Many of the team members are not eager to continue to spend so much time on inservice activities, although some have indicated a willingness to serve on an inservice committee. One administrator, after lavishing praise on the teacher-led inservice program, has indicated that there will be no inservice programs next year. On the other hand, one team has been asked to provide more inservice programs in its cooperative, as well as in a neighboring one. This team has a contact person with inservice responsibilities who has been a very active supporter of the project.

Recommendations and remaining questions. The institutionalization of teacher planned and implemented inservice programs is a worthwhile goal, but it will not necessarily occur after one successful program. More detailed plans must be made to provide the impetus. It is probable that an active supporter on-site and close to the administrative level is helpful, but further investigation into the issue is required. The various factors that may facilitate the adoption of teacher-led inservice programs, both those involving teacher willingness and administrator approval, remain open to question.

Hypothesis 7: A university project staff can assist education agencies in implementing an ongoing system of teacher planned and implemented professional development.

Justification. As is stated in more detail in the beginning of this paper, research and theory supports the concept of teachers having major responsibility for their own professional development. Teachers have many of the requisite skills and with administrative support they should be able to learn additional skills and then implement a process of inservice curriculum development.

Conclusions and evidence. With administrative support and training by project staff, teachers can design, develop, and deliver inservice education. Hypotheses 1 through 6 describe some of the conclusions and evidence supporting this summary hypothesis. It is clear from our experience that some teachers are more adept than others and that some administrators are more supportive than others. In addition, a great deal of personal time is required from teachers willing to shoulder inservice responsibilities.

Recommendations and remaining questions. We recommend that further efforts be made to aid education agencies in implementing an ongoing system of teacher-directed professional development. The burden, however, should be shared by administrators as well. They need to provide encouragement and some released time, in addition to cooperating throughout the total process. Investigation into optimal composition of an inservice team should be initiated. For example, what should be the proportion of teachers, administrators, and other involved individuals; what should be the final size, and what should be the selection criteria? Another question that remains is: Can teachers skilled in inservice curriculum development specify their needs to an "outside" inservice provider in such a way that the resultant program will be acceptable to the audience? If the answer is yes, teachers can have a great deal of involvement in their own professional development without having to design, develop, and deliver each inservice session they need. Teachers can collaborate with consultants, completing some inservice tasks and monitoring the consultants' completion of others. This collaboration, then, can become part of a planned system of inservice education, instead of being a quick answer to an apparent inservice need.

References

Berman, P., & McLaughlin, M. W. Federal programs supporting educational change, vol. IV: The findings in review. Santa Monica, California: The Rand Corporation, April, 1975.

Berman, P., & McLaughlin, M. W. Federal programs supporting education change, vol VII: Factors affecting implementation and continuation. Santa Monica, California: The Rand Corporation, April, 1977.

Cruickshank, D. R., Lorish, C., & Thompson, L. What we think we know about inservice education. Journal of Teacher Education, 1979, 30, 27-31.

Edelfelt, R. A. (Ed.). Inservice education: Criteria for and examples of local programs. Bellingham: Western Washington State College, 1977.

Hutson, H. Inservice best practices: The learning of general education. Bloomington, Indiana: National Inservice Network, February 1979.

Johnson, M. Inservice education: Priority for the '80s. National Council of States on Inservice Education, 1980. (distributed by the National Dissemination Center, Syracuse University School of Education).

Joyce, B. R., Howey, K. R., Yarger, S. J., Hill, W. C., Waterman, F. T., Vance, B. A., Parker, D. W., & Baker, M. G. Issues to face, ISTE Report I, Palo Alto, Calif., 1976. (Monograph sponsored by National Center for Education Statistics and Teacher Corps.). (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 129733.).

Joyce, B. R., McNair, K. M., Diaz, R., McKibbin, M. D., Waterman, F. T., & Baker, M. G. Interviews: Perceptions of professionals and policy makers, ISTE Report II, Palo Alto, Calif.: Stanford Center for Research and Development on Teaching, 1976. (Monograph sponsored by National Center for Education Statistics and Teacher Corps). (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 142546).

Kaplan, A. The conduct of inquiry. Scranton, Pa.: Chandler, 1964.

Knowles, M. The adult learner: A neglected species. Houston: Gulf Publishing Co., 1978.

Lawrence, G., Baker, D., Elzie, P., & Hansen, B. Patterns of effective in-service education: A state of the art summary of research on materials and procedures for changing teacher behaviors in in-service education. Gainesville: Florida State Department of Education, 1974.

McLaughlin, M. W., & Marsh, D. D. Staff development and school change. Teachers College Record, September, 1978, 80, 1, 69-94.

National Inservice Network, Quality practices task force final report. Bloomington: Indiana University, 1980.

Nicholson, A., Joyce, B. R., Parker, D., & Waterman, F. T. The literature on inservice teacher education: An analytic review, ISTE Report III. Palo Alto, Calif., 1976. (Monograph sponsored by National Center for Educational Statistics and Teacher Corps.). (ERIC Document Reproduction No. ED 129734).

Rosenshine, B., & Berliner, D. Academic engaged time. British Journal of Teacher Education, January, 1978, 4, 1, 3-16.

Skrtic, T. M., Clark, F. L., & Bolland, K. A. Local agency comprehensive system of personnel development: Habituating building-based in-service training. Lawrence: University of Kansas, 1980. (Proposal to the United States Office of Special Education).

Skrtic, T. M., Knowlton, H. E., & Clark, F. L. Action versus reaction: A curriculum development approach to inservice education. Focus on Exceptional Children, 1979, 2, 1-16.

Yarger, S. J., Boyer, J., Howey, K. R., Weil, M., Pais, R. M., Warnat, W. I., Bhaerman, R. D., Duke, R., Darland, D., Joyce, B. R., & Hill, W. C. Creative authority and collaboration: A collection of position papers, ISTE Report IV, Palo Alto, Calif., 1976. (Monograph sponsored by National Center for Education Statistics and Teacher Corps.). (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. Ed 129735).

Appendix

Knowledge Tests

Eleven teachers completed a pretest, which included essay questions designed to tap knowledge in the following areas:

1. goals and objectives
2. needs assessment
3. inservice delivery alternatives
4. evaluation

Analysis of their responses revealed that most teachers understand the concept of goals and objectives but few had even an awareness of needs assessment and evaluation principles or of the variety of delivery alternatives available for inservice programs.

A final exam was administered at the conlcusion of the second training course. Instead of administering an alternative form of the pretest, a more straightforward exam was developed. This gave teachers who had acquired inservice skills but had not yet generallized them to other situations an opportunity to display their knowledge. Nine essay questions addressed the following topics:

1. Content, presenter style, and audience needs in relation to choosing a delivery format
2. Purposes of warm-up activities
3. Alternative closings for inservice programs
4. Inservice media
5. Lecture "scripts"
6. Inservice evaluations
7. Coping with problem participants

Ten teachers completed the questionnaire. Responses were scored excellent, adequate, or less than adequate. Of the 90 responses, twenty-five were judged excellent; nine, less than adequate; and the remaining, adequate. No individual scored less than adequate on more than two questions.

Staff Observations and Experiences

Project staff met frequently to discuss planned and completed project activities, perceived results of training activities, communications with team members and administrators, and team members' inservice products. We also met with national, state, and university-faculty advisory committees to discuss our successes and problems.

Comments

Project staff attended the inservice sessions and noted comments made by audience members and administrators. In addition, some advisory board members attended some sessions and their comments were solicited as well. An example of the comments follow.

1. I am impressed (Professor of Adult Education)

2. This is the best inservice program I have seen in the 14 years I've been here (Director of the Area Vocational Technical School)

3. I'm getting better cooperation from the vocational instructors since this project started (Special education teacher)

4. I understand the special educators' concerns better now (Vocational instructor)

5. These teachers really have worked hard on this program and it's made a real difference in our school (Interpreter for the deaf)

Inservice Questionnaire

To add to our knowledge regarding teachers' perceptions of typical inservice programs and the characteristics they believe are important, two questionnaires have been distributed to 200 special and vocational educators in Kansas communities that have and have not participated in the project. Multivariate analyses of the responses will allow us to specify some of the inservice characteristics teachers believe are important and to compare their perceptions of teacher-led versus other-led inservice programs on those characteristics. Twenty-five percent of the questionnaires have been returned to date. Analyses will begin when more questionnaires have been received. The questionnaires are provided in Exhibit B.

EXHIBIT A

October 8, 19[illegible]

SW KS AVTS, Dodge City

TEACHING TIPS FOR SPECIAL STUDENTS

Inservice Evaluation

Circle one: Vocational - 8 Special Education - 11 Other - 0

DIRECTIONS: Please answer the following questions as completely and honestly as you can.

1. Which information or inservice activity was useful to you?

Special Education: *The packet (3). Textbook material adaption to sp. ed. students. Good information in several areas. Some. Group discussion on presentations of specific subject matter. When I have time to go through the booklet, I'm sure the techniques will be v ry good. Howard's Flow Charts, concepts, task orientation. Alternative teaching techniques. Group activity about appropriate teaching techniques.*

Vocational Education: *All. Getting to know other special educational teachers to know how they handle problems. The Group Sessions. Use of overlay. Angie's Presentation. Little--mostly positive--any negative attitudes? Textbook uses.*

2. Do you plan to use any of the techniques presented?

Which Ones?

Special Education: *Yes. Yes, postive comments and reading techniques. I already do (2). Yes--all. Yes, flow chart ideas. Yes, textbook use. Maybe flow charts.*

Vocational Education: *Yes. Yes, unsure at this time, need to read packet first. I already use most of these techniques for regular students.*

Which techniques do you already use?

Special Education: *None. Most of them. Techniques for teaching EMR & LD. Task analysis. Have used most of them in the past. Skeleton, visual aids. Over-learning and practice. Those appropriate. Some reading techniques, positive approach, oral work for students, and level of students. Outlines, demonstrations, hands-on techniques, etc. Learning techniques. Alternative test taking options and instruction.*

Vocational Education: *I already use most of them. Demonstration. Oral testing. Reviewing them using the overhead, explain terms.*

3. (For vocational educators) Do you feel more confident about working with special education students in your class than you did before the inservice?

Please explain.

Vocational Education: *No, I will never be comfortable having special education students in my class. This will all help. No (2). Yes (2). Yes, good tips in the handouts.*

4. Do you now feel more comfortable about working with vocational instructors/ special education instructors?

Please comment:

Special Education: *Yes. Yes, very good. There wasn't enough interaction with vocational instructors to evaluate this. Yes, I know they are interested in helping the Special Education students. Yes, we are there to help the student. Yes, the Tedddie program has been extremely helpful in communicating with the Vo Tech teachers and negotiating with them to integrate my pupils in their classrooms. Yes, more informed. Yes, their real people, they know a lot about their area. Yes, an awareness of their efforts is very commendable. I have always felt comfortable working with them when beneficial for my students. For the gifted area, I'm still not particularly sure as to how to interface these programs.*

Vocational Education: *(?). Yes, this reinforces. Vocational instructors. I feel about the same. The only problem I see is to help the special education students with the whole class, I tend to lose the interest of the others. Yes, I have common concern. Yes.*

5. Would you have made any changes in the format or schedule of the inservice?

Special Education: *No (6). No Comment (2). Yes (3).*

Vocational Education: *Wouldn't had --------- speak. Would have made the atmoshphere cooler, but you tried. No (6).*

What changes would you have made?

Special Education: *No (4). It was excellent. Tasks a little long. More small groups of Special Education and Vo Tech to discuss techniques and approaches. I would have made sure I had sufficient notes and was aware of the microphone. More activities rather than the lecture. Perhaps too much information presented for one meeting. Participant participation in bringing out some ideas might have given concrete example for classroom use. More direct interaction between vocational and special educators--chance to ask each other specific questions. More specific suggestions and activities.*

Vocational Education: *More group work. Felt somewhat rushed--would have been good to have more interaction. None (6).*

TABULATION OF EVALUATIONS OF SALINA AVTS INSERVICE

November 7, 1980

Parts 1-3 Ratings of individual presentations

PRESENTATION	RESPONSES (N=36)													
	Meaningful & Useful Information was Presented					My Needs were Addressed					Presenter was good				
	SA (4)	A (3)	D (2)	SD (1)	$\bar{X}$	SA (4)	A (3)	D (2)	SD (1)	$\bar{X}$	SA (4)	A (3)	D (2)	SD (1)	$\bar{X}$
Simulations	15	16	1	0	3.4	14	15	2	0	3.4	19	12	1	0	3.6
Epilepsy	23	11	0	0	3.7	16	13	1	1	3.4	16	15	0	0	3.5
Special Projects	15	14	2	0	3.4	9	17	3	0	3.2	18	11	1	0	3.6
Adapting Materials	14	15	1	0	3.4	12	15	2	0	3.3	18	13	0	0	3.6
RSVP	9	17	2	0	3.3	5	21	2	0	3.1	13	16	0	0	3.4

Part 4 Rating of total program

STATEMENT	RESPONSES				
	SA (4)	A (3)	D (2)	SD (1)	$\bar{X}$
The presentations were interesting	19	15	2	0	3.5

KEY

SA= Strongly Agree (4)
A= Agree (3)
D= Disagree (2)
SD= Strongly Disagree (1)
$\bar{X}$= The average

NOTE

Evaluation forms were collected from 36 individuals. However, each individual did not respond to each question.

Part 5

What were the two most important ideas you received from this workshop? *

Material modification, adapting materials (8)

Simulations: information on hearing impairments and adaptations for physically disabled (6)

Accept the student where he is and go from there (3)

Better understanding of epilepsy, have cots available for boys and girls who need to take a break for medical (epileptic) reasons, what the physically handicapped can do. (3)

The ability of Bonnie Consolo and Paul (armless individuals) (2)

Talk slowly

Repeat

It's necessary to discipline...to work with the disadvantaged

Keep your sense of humor

Greatful I'm not handicapped and how to cope or adapt to it

Consideration for the handicapped

Regardless of the handicap a person can be trained.

Handicapped are not necessarily handicapped other than physically

LD does not mean stupid

RSVP projects and opportunities

Special Projects

Have more inservice

Revisiting of previous acquired knowledge

Nothing for shop or classroom instructions that is for better instruction.

I feel the simulation groups...not beneficial with the...

Handicaps are...handicapping. More assistance available than most of us realize.

*NOTE

Fourteen individuals wrote two ideas, thirteen wrote one, and nine did not respond to this question. The number in parentheses following some of the statements indicates the number of individuals who wrote similar statements. Ellipses indicate illegible words.

Part 6

QUESTION	RESPONSE			
	College Credit Skill Training	Seminar	Other Workshops	No Answer
If you desire further information, in what format?	8	3	11	15

Part 7

OTHER COMMENTS *

POSITIVE

I think the day was well planned, well organized, well presented. (4)

This has been a most constructive and interesting workshop. Thank you.

I average a training station every 2-3 minutes in my regular class and do not have enough time to give the disadvantaged the time they need, so have other students help--some of these students should have seen this workshop.

One hell of a good inservice!

One of the best programs that we have ever had at Vo-Tech. It lets instructor know that they can get professional help from local people, right here at Vo-Tech School, with student learning problems.

Paul was good! Good inservice program!

Various topics were equally interesting

Good material

One of the better if not the best inservice days we have had

NEGATIVE

Time span shorter

Did not stick to schedule (3)

Smoking should not be allowed in class sessions

Don't we learn by observing--how or what method do we retain best! Reading, listening, observing--feel if we visited industry we could learn a lot by observing especially for ideas to help handicapped.

Guests and speakers should be seated at the front of the room so when they are introduced, the audience does not have to turn around to locate them.

Speaker not here on time.

I feel that RSVP is a good program but question what the purpose was in their presentation to the staff. If SAVTS is interested in becoming involved, the administration should get together with RSVP and draw up specifics to be then presented to the staff.

The last session time schedule should have been...

NEUTRAL

Need an extra part-time qualified instructor person to give the disadvantaged this consideration which they really need.

* NOTE

Fourteen individuals wrote one or more comment; twenty-two did not respond. The number in parentheses following some of the statements indicates the number of individuals who wrote similar statements.

JANUARY 14, 1981

SW KS AVTS, DODGE CITY

INSERVICE QUESTIONNAIRE

Check one: Vocational Instructor 9

Special Educator _____

Other (specify) _____

Please rank order your preferred inservice providers. Use a 1 for your first choice, a 2 for your second choice, and so on, with a 4,5, or 6 indicating your last choice.

Average Rank		Rankings
3.4	local administrators	2 6 6 2 2 3 3
1.9	local teachers	1 3 3 1 1 1 1 1 5
3.8	personnel from the State Department of Education	4 4 5 4 5 2 2 4
3.8	professors from universities	3 5 4 3 6 4 3 2
1.8	other, specify People from industry	1 1 4 1
2.0	other, specify Field trips	2 2

What did you appreciate most about this inservice?

Guest Industrial people
Good pointers on safety
Variety of presentations
Film & demonstrations
Safety
Work was well presented
Done by own staff, and came directly to point.
More of a 2-way communication instead of lecture.

What did you appreciate least about this inservice?

Length
Talk from Arrowhead West.

Overall, how did this inservice compare with the last one you attended that was not led by teachers? This one was

9 better

_____ about the same

_____ worse

JANUARY 14, 1981

SW KS AVTS, DODGE CITY

INSERVICE QUESTIONNAIRE

Check one: Vocational Instructor 4

Special Educator _____

Other (specify) _____

Please rank order your preferred inservice providers. Use a 1 for your first choice, a 2 for your second choice, and so on, with a 4,5, or 6 indicating your last choice.

Average Rank		Rankings
3	local administrators	2 6 2 2
1	local teachers	1 1 1 1
4.5	personnel from the State Department of Education	6 6 4 3
4.5	professors from universities	5 6 3 4
_____	other, specify _____	
_____	other, specify _____	

What did you appreciate most about this inservice?

The chance to state opinion
Opportunity to give safety demonstration
Awareness level of shop safety

What did you appreciate least about this inservice?

Film
Whole thing was good--didn't consider any part a low point

Overall, how did this inservice compare with the last one you attended that was not led by teachers? This one was

_____ better

4 about the same

_____ worse

JANUARY 14, 1981

SW KS AVTS, DODGE CITY

INSERVICE QUESTIONNAIRE

Check one: Vocational Instructor 1

Special Educator _____

Other (specify) 1 Work/Study Coordinator

Please rank order your preferred inservice providers. Use a 1 for your first choice, a 2 for your second choice, and so on, with a 4,5, or 6 indicating your last choice.

Average Rank		Rankings
_____	local administrators	
1	local teachers	1 1
_____	personnel from the State Department of Education	
_____	professors from universities	
2	other, specify Spec. education instructors	2
3	other, specify Arrowhead West people	3

What did you appreciate most about this inservice?

It was very practical
Safety Awareness

What did you appreciate least about this inservice?

Perhaps it should have been longer since the subject is so important, then more shops could have been visited.

Is TEDDDIE not to assist voc. ed. and special ed. instructors to work together? We did not have that much direct contact with each other.

Overall, how did this inservice compare with the last one you attended that was not led by teachers? This one was

_____ better

_____ about the same

_____ worse

2 no answer (all had been teacher led)

JANUARY 14, 1981

SW KS AVTS, DODGE CITY

INSERVICE QUESTIONNAIRE

Check one: Vocational Instructor _____
Special Educator 6
Other (specify) _____

Please rank order your preferred inservice providers. Use a 1 for your first choice, a 2 for your second choice, and so on, with a 4,5, or 6 indicating your last choice.

Average Rank		Rankings
3.3	local administrators	4 3 3 2 2 6
1.5	local teachers	1 4 1 1 1 1
3.5	personnel from the State Department of Education	3 1 4 4 4 5
2.6	professors from universities	2 2 2 3 3 4
2	other, specify Sales Rep from school supply companies	2
3	other, specify Authors of books	3

What did you appreciate most about this inservice?

Learning strategies presentation (2) Being able to work on continuum of skills
Material ideas from other teachers
KNEA
Learning strategies material
No comment

What did you appreciate least about this inservice?

No comment (3)
Unorganized at first
Would rather see entire videotape rather than try to incorporate too many things
All was OK

Overall, how did this inservice compare with the last one you attended that was not led by teachers? This one was

6 better
_____ about the same
_____ worse

Formative Evaluations

Open-ended formative evaluation questionnaires were distributed to trainees at various points throughout the training courses. The following questions were included:

1. I appreciate...
2. I was frustrated by...
3. I wish...
4. I think the instructors...
5. The material covered was...
6. I plan...
7. I learned...
8. I hope...
9. I am concerned...
10. I liked...
11. The content of the last 2-3 hours...
12. If I were an instructor...

In addition, more specific questionnaires were distributed regarding several of the presentations made during the courses. The following questions were included, among others:

1. What did you like best about the career education slide-tape show?
2. What did you like least about the presentation on adult education?

Finally, a questionnaire regarding the whole training experience was distributed. It included questions such as:

1. What have been the strengths of this week?
2. Have you learned useful knowledge throughout the training courses?
3. Do you plan to apply principles of designing, developing, and delivering inservice education to other activities?
4. How have your feelings about project goals changed?

Responses to all these formative evaluation efforts ranged from the silly-- " I wish my feet didn't stink" --to the insightful-- "it will take time and easy steps to get total involvement." Responses were tabulated and considered as project staff made plans for upcoming sessions and follow-up activities.

Audience Evaluations

Team members designed evaluation forms to be completed by their audiences at the conclusion of their inservice programs. A sample of summaries of these forms is provided in Exhibit A.

JANUARY 14, 1981

SW KS AVTS, DODGE CITY

INSERVICE QUESTIONNAIRE

Check one: Vocational Instructor _____
Special Educator 10
Other (specify) 1 aide

Please rank order your preferred inservice providers. Use a 1 for your first choice, a 2 for your second choice, and so on, with a 4,5, or 6 indicating your last choice.

Average Rank		Rankings
4.2	local administrators	4 6 4 3 1 4 4 6 4 6
2.9	local teachers	2 5 5 4 2 3 1 3 3 1
3.1	personnel from the State Department of Education	3 4 3 2 4 1 3 4 2 5
1.9	professors from universities	1 3 2 1 3 2 2 2 1 2
4	other, specify guest speakers	4
3	other, specify material reps	3
1	NEA (e.g. workshop on stress)	1
1.5	Person from own area of exceptionality	2 1
1	group mtg for curriculum discussion, testing, methods, etc.	1

What did you appreciate most about this inservice?

Talking to other teachers about good materials used in other programs (2)
KNEA (2)
No comment (2)
Getting in specific groups
Information packet(2) (I will use it & the suggestions)
Film
Agenda - laid out and followed
Materials to work through & with
Visiting with teachers in same area of exceptionality

What did you appreciate least about this inservice? No comment (3)

How unorganized it was
Didn't pertain to my area of ed
Overview of video
Started too late
First part wasn't long enough to understand what he was talking about
Disorganization-waste of time-nothing accomplished
Too late
Not enough time for group discussions
Didn't need to have info packet summarized

Overall, how did this inservice compare with the last one you attended that was not led by teachers? This one was

_____ better
11 about the same
_____ worse

Please allow 1/2 day inservice for discussing classroom materials with other teachers, same exceptionality

JANUARY 14, 1981

SW KS AVTS, DODGE CITY

INSERVICE QUESTIONNAIRE

Check one: Vocational Instructor _____
Special Educator 7
Other (specify) 1 paraprofessional

Please rank order your preferred inservice providers. Use a 1 for your first choice, a 2 for your second choice, and so on, with a 4,5, or 6 indicating your last choice.

Average Rank		Rankings
3.0	local administrators	4 2 2 3 3 4
2.6	local teachers	1 1 3 4 4 3
3.2	personnel from the State Department of Education	3 4 4 2 5 1
1.7	professors from universities	2 3 1 1 1 2
2	other, specify personnel from other coops, districts	2
_____	other, specify _____	

1 comment: The program is more important than the presenter.

What did you appreciate most about this inservice?

Group meetings
Meeting with other instructors
Video explaining
Visiting with other staff members
Film
Group discussion
Nothing
KNEA mtg
seeing other teachers discussing our programs

What did you appreciate least about this inservice?

Last too long (after school) (2)
Too much time getting started, organized (2)
Would like to try a full day inservice
Time element
Videotape and lecture
Meeting ran late due to poor organization
No value
Lack of organization
No comment

Overall, how did this inservice compare with the last one you attended that was not led by teachers? This one was

_____ better
_____ about the same
8 worse

JANUARY 14, 1981

SW KS AVTS, DODGE CITY

INSERVICE QUESTIONNAIRE

Check one: Vocational Instructor _____
Special Educator 2
Other (specify) _____

Please rank order your preferred inservice providers. Use a 1 for your first choice, a 2 for your second choice, and so on, with a 4,5, or 6 indicating your last choice.

Average Rank		Rankings
4.5	local administrators	3 6
4.0	local teachers	4 4
3.5	personnel from the State Department of Education	2 5
2.0	professors from universities	1 3
1	other, specify someone specific to an area of exceptionality	1
2	other, specify teachers from outside coop (for specific exceptionalities)	2

What did you appreciate most about this inservice?

Meeting with teachers from specific program area

Group discussion

What did you appreciate least about this inservice?

No comment

The time--why not start at 1:00 or 1:30?

Overall, how did this inservice compare with the last one you attended that was not led by teachers? This one was

_____ better
_____ about the same
_____ worse
2 first one

JANUARY 14, 1981

SW KS AVTS, DODGE CITY

INSERVICE QUESTIONNAIRE

Check one: Vocational Instructor _____
Special Educator 1
Other (specify) _____

Please rank order your preferred inservice providers. Use a 1 for your first choice, a 2 for your second choice, and so on, with a 4,5, or 6 indicating your last choice.

1 local administrators
2 local teachers
4 personnel from the State Department of Education
3 professors from universities
_____ other, specify _____
_____ other, specify _____

What did you appreciate most about this inservice?

No comment

What did you appreciate least about this inservice?

No comment

Overall, how did this inservice compare with the last one you attended that was not led by teachers? This one was

_____ better
_____ about the same
_____ worse
1 no response

SUMMARY OF EVALUATIONS OF SWK AVTS INSERVICE

Vocational Instructors

January 14, 1981

1. I HOPE...

this thing keeps going
that all handicapped persons can be and will be employable
everyone understands why safety is first
we have more inservice conducted by teachers on our staff
bad accidents do not occur
we got our point across--what is simple
we can continue to have the good record of few accidents in our shops
I can use some of the ideas
that I don't get a student hurt in the shop
the EMR and LD instructors paid very close attention to the problems in the shop
we learned about safety
that administrators, special ed. personnel, etc. don't expect too much from educators in training of special students.
we can tour Arrowhead West in the near future

2. I AM CONCERNED...

that I cannot measure up to handicapped person's needs
with people using equipment whether they are familiar with it or not. The pros are usually the ones who get hurt.
that the people who would benefit most from today's demonstrations were not present.
on employment of the handicapped
about the safety of everyone in the shop
that the students can benefit from the training
that one of these days we'll have a really serious accident
for the safety of the students
that sometimes that we can get so careless
about mainstreaming into hazardous occupation areas for training
about safety for the handicap
that students don't think SAFETY FIRST--especially when they must be reminded quite often
about the students placed in our classes without the instructors knowledge of their handicaps before their admission

3. I LIKED...

Gerald Schmidt
the demonstrations
the filmstrip mostly
the presentations and demonstrations
the chance to express my feelings about safety
the films
the film and demonstrations in the shops.
the outline
the looks on some faces as the demonstrations were made
the film and the shop demonstrations
the film
the shop safety demonstrations. Very effective, I hope their well made points were made with the right people!

4. THE CONTENT OF THE LAST 1-2 HOURS...

was very worthwhile
concerns everybody not just handicapped
was informative
was very beneficial if it is used
was very good and informative
was good
was interesting--planned last
was informative
was quite interesting and makes me want to become more aware of what goes on in each of our vocational areas.
was very well paced and informative

5. I PLAN...

to follow up on this
to review safety in my own program and be aware of it in other programs
to re-evaluate my safety program
to use parts of the presentations
to continue being as safe as I can
to use a more step by step approach
to be more aware when I walk through the shop areas
to make some task analysis
continue to emphasize safety above all other skills of tool and machine operation
to be very explicit concerning safety in the classroom
use some of the ideas
to be more careful walking through the shops and to be more aware when I must be there

6. I LEARNED...

a lot
that many businesses do not appreciate the fact that handicapped persons are employable
I feel safety is important no more or no less to disabled people as to any one else. Safety is safety.
some safety problems
that simple things can cause safety accidents
that there are many more dangers in the shop areas than I thought
that some people will never change
it is a serious problem
to use ear plugs when Allan pops the balloon. Very good pointers.
more about the handicapped person
I am convinced that safety applies to all and not just to the "special" students. In that sense all are "special" and must strictly follow safety guidelines
more interesting facts about Arrowhead West and about our own shops

Note: Fourteen instructors responded to this questionnaire

EXHIBIT B

INSERVICE QUESTIONNAIRE

Please read through the following statements about inservice programs. Then place a plus (+) next to the 5 statements with which you most agree. Also, place a minus (-) next to the 5 statements with which you least agree (even if you agree with them all, choose the 5 you think are less important than the others).

___ An inservice program should lead directly to increased student achievement.

___ An inservice program should challenge participants.

___ An inservice program should increase teacher morale.

___ An inservice session should motivate teachers to try new techniques.

___ An inservice program should provide information on required teacher paperwork.

___ An inservice program should improve the school's efficiency.

___ An inservice program should provide teachers with new skills.

___ An inservice program should cover facts related to subject areas.

___ An inservice program should make the teacher's job easier.

___ An inservice program should improve the curriculum.

___ An inservice program should inspire teachers to seek further information on the topics covered.

___ An inservice program should cover instructional techniques.

___ An inservice program should provide materials teachers can use in their classrooms.

___ An inservice program should lead to better cooperation among teachers and administrators.

___ An inservice program should provide teachers with ideas they can apply in their classrooms immediately.

___ An inservice program should foster unity among teachers.

Please rank the following statements. Use a 1 for the most important statement, a 2 for the next most important statement, and so on, with 7 indicating the least important statement. Do not use any number twice.

___ Inservice providers should model effective teaching strategies

___ The information provided during an inservice session should be compiled in a format that facilitates retrieval.

___ An inservice program should be geared to the appropriate level (e.g., awareness of concepts before practicing of skills...)

___ The inservice provider should capture and hold the attention of the participants.

___ Adequate directions should be given for anything teachers are expected to do after the inservice.

___ Individual participants should not be allowed to disrupt the inservice session.

___ Inservice activities should include on-site demonstrations with learners.

Please rank the following statements. Use a 1 for the most important statement, a 2 for the next most important statement, and so on, with 7 indicating the least important statement. Do not use any number twice.

___ Inservice providers should speak from the teachers' point of view.

___ The format of an inservice should be appropriate for its purpose.

___ Inservice sessions should include planned breaks.

___ Instructions for group activities should be adequate.

___ Inservice providers should encourage questions.

___ The inservice audience should share knowledge and experiences as a planned part of the program.

___ Inservice handouts should be directly applicable to the teachers needs.

Please rank the following statements. Use a 1 for the most important statement, a 2 for the next most important statement, and so on, with 7 indicating the least important statement. Do not use any number twice.

___ Inservice providers should be patient.

___ The goals and objectives of the inservice session should be publicized in advance.

___ Inservice handouts should be limited in number.

___ Inservice providers should display confidence in their expertise

___ The inservice atmosphere should be free and open (teachers should not feel constrained to hide their real problems).

___ The seating arrangement should be appropriate for the type of activity.

___ Inservice sessions should include opportunities for teachers to practice new skills.

Please rank the following statements. Use a 1 for the most important statement, a 2 for the next most important statement, and so on, with 7 indicating the least important statement. Do not use any number twice.

___ The inservice provider should build enthusiasm among the participants

___ Teachers should be treated with personal and professional respect throughout the inservice process.

___ Inservice sessions should be organized.

___ Inservice providers should use language familiar to the participants.

___ An inservice agenda should be given to each participant.

___ Inservice sessions should include an appropriate mix of background theory and practical application.

___ Only media that enhance the learning experience, rather than merely entertain, should be used.

For each pair of statements below, please place a check mark (✓) beside the one statement you agree with more. Even if you agree with both, or do not agree with either, choose the one that appeals to you more than the other.

___ An inservice program should inspire teachers to seek further information on the topics covered.

___ Teachers should leave an inservice program knowing exactly how to apply what they have learned.

___ Inservice programs should be strictly devoted to the content being covered.

___ Inservice programs should include warm-up activities and unstructured discussion sessions.

___ An inservice session should thoroughly cover just one topic.

___ An inservice session should introduce several topics.

___ The best inservice programs are those in which teachers share their experiences and ideas with each other.

___ The best inservice programs have guest speakers who are known for their expertise.

___ An inservice program is worthwhile only if it leads directly to improved student achievement.

___ An inservice program is worthwhile if it helps teachers function more efficiently.

___ Inservice sessions should include individualized activities for teachers.

___ Inservice sessions should be designed for the typical teacher.

___ Inservice sessions should include planned follow-up activities with assistance available.

___ Inservice programs should not require follow-up activities.

Please rank the following statements. Use a 1 for the one you most agree with, then a 2, and so on, with a 5 indicating the one you agree with least. Use each number, from 1 through 5, even if you agree with each statement or disagree with each statement.

___ The purpose of an inservice program should be to increase teacher's knowledge.

___ The purpose of an inservice program should be to improve teachers' skills.

___ The purpose of an inservice program should be to change teachers' attitude.

___ The purpose of an inservice program should be to develop classroom materials.

___ The purpose of an inservice program should be to plan changes in the curriculum.

Please list any inservice characteristics you think are more important than the ones included on this questionnaire.

1.

2.

3.

4.

5.

When was the last inservice program you attended? If you don't remember the date, approximately how many months ago was it?_____

THANK YOU FOR YOUR ASSISTANCE. A SUMMARY OF RESULTS WILL BE SENT TO YOUR SCHOOL FOR YOUR REVIEW.

INSERVICE QUESTIONNAIRE

Please identify the last inservice program you attended. Approximate if you do not remember the exact details.

Topic(s): _____ Date: _____

Presenter(s): _____

Please indicate the purpose(s) of the last inservice program you attended by placing a check mark (✓) in the most appropriate space following each listed purpose.

The purpose of the last inservice program I attended was to...	Only Purpose	A Major Purpose	A Minor Purpose	Not A Purpose
1. increase student achievement.				
2. increase teacher morale.				
3. motivate teachers to try new techniques.				
4. provide information on required teacher paperwork.				
5. improve the school's efficiency.				
6. provide teachers with new skills.				
7. provide facts related to my subject area.				
8. make the teacher's job easier.				
9. improve the curriculum.				
10. inspire teachers to seek further information.				
11. provide teachers with classroom materials.				
12. promote better cooperation among teachers and administrators.				
13. foster unity among teachers.				
14. improve teachers' efficiency.				
15. increase teachers' knowledge.				

In each of the following sets of statements, please place a plus (+) beside the one that most applies to the last inservice program you attended, and a minus (-) beside the statement that least applies. Please assign a plus and a minus in each group, if even all the statements do or do not apply.

During the last inservice program I attended, I was...

____ bored.
____ bothered by disruptive participants.
____ restless from sitting too long.

During the last inservice program I attended, I was...

____ challenged.
____ attentive.
____ able to discuss real concerns.

The handouts at the last inservice program I attended were...

____ worthwhile for use in my classroom.
____ useful for background information.
____ easy to use.
____ a concise compilation of information presented.

The handouts at the last inservice program I attended were...

____ useless.
____ overwhelming (i.e., too many).
____ of poor quality (e.g., poorly duplicated).
____ hard to understand.

Please indicate the extent of your agreement with the following statement by placing a check mark (✓) in the appropriate space following each statement.

At the last inservice session I attended, the speaker(s)...	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. modeled effective teaching techniques.				
2. captured and held the audience's attention.				
3. spoke from the teacher's point of view.				
4. gave adequate instructions for activities.				
5. explained how to apply techniques in the classroom.				
6. encouraged the audience to ask questions.				
7. were patient.				
8. displayed confidence in their expertise.				
9. built enthusiasm among the participants.				
10. were organized.				

Please read through the following statements about inservice programs. Then place a plus (+) next to the 4 statements that best describe the last inservice program you attended and a minus (-) beside the 4 that least typify it. Please assign 4 pluses and 4 minuses even if all the statements are good or poor descriptors.

The last inservice program I attended...

____ was geared to the appropriate knowledge level.

____ included group discussion.

____ followed an agenda that was publicized in advance.

____ incorporated useful media.

____ included appropriate warm-up activities.

____ met my expectations in terms of content covered.

____ included opportunities for sharing information and experiences with other teachers.

____ included follow-up activities, with assistance.

____ included individualized activities.

____ included an appropriate mix of background theory and practical application.

____ was designed for the typical teacher.

Please read through the following statements about inservice programs. Then place a plus (+) next to the 4 statements that best describe the last inservice program you attended and a minus (-) beside the 4 that least typify it. Please assign 4 pluses and 4 minuses even if all the statements are good or poor descriptors.

The last inservice program I attended...

____ did not include adequate instructions for group activities.

____ included silly games.

____ included too little information about too many topics.

____ included too much theory.

____ was disorganized.

____ had no agenda.

____ did not include a question-answer period.

____ included too little theory.

____ had an inappropriate seating arrangement.

____ followed a format inappropriate for its purpose.

Please indicate the effects of the last inservice program you attended by marking the following statements true or false.

As a result of the last inservice program I attended...

____ I changed an attitude.
____ I tried a new instructional technique in my class.
____ I sought more advice from other teachers in my school.
____ I used new materials in my class.
____ I developed new materials for my class.
____ I work differently with support staff.
____ I cooperate better with administrators.
____ Administrators cooperate better with me.
____ I complete my paperwork faster.
____ I ordered new resource materials.
____ I did nothing different.
____ I... (please specify what you do differently) _____

_____

Please complete the following sentences.

The best thing about the last inservice I attended was...

The worst thing about the last inservice I attended was...

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR ASSISTANCE. A SUMMARY OF RESULTS WILL BE SENT TO YOUR SCHOOL FOR YOUR REVIEW.